IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q86306

Nobuhiko FUSHIMI, et al.

Allowed: April 17, 2009

Appln. No.: 10/525,197

Group Art Unit: 1623

Confirmation No.: 7757

Examiner: Eric OLSON

Filed: February 22, 2005

For:

PYRAZOLE DERIVATIVES, MEDICINAL COMPOSITION CONTAINING THE

SAME, MEDICINAL USE THEREOF, AND INTERMEDIATE FOR PRODUCTION

THEREOF

APPLICATION FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.705

MAIL STOP PATENT EXTENSION

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In view of the Federal Circuit's recent ruling in *Wyeth v. Kappos*, U.S. App. LEXIS 300 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 7, 2010), Patentee requests reconsideration of the Director's determination of patent term adjustment (PTA) reported on the face of U.S. Patent No. 7,635,684 (the '684 Patent). Patentee had previously filed an Application for Patent Term Adjustment on July 16, 2009, but on November 10, 2009, the USPTO determined that the Application was premature because the patent had not yet issued. See the Decision on Application for Patent Term Adjustment of November 10, 2009 (the "Decision"). The Decision stated that Patentee "may wait until the time of the issuance of the patent and file a request for reconsideration of the patent term adjustment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.705(d)." See the Decision at page 2. Accordingly,

Attorney Docket No.: Q86306 U.S. Application No.: 10/525,197

Patentee is presenting the present Application, in accordance with the instructions set forth by the Decision. In addition, Patentee notes that the '684 Patent issued on December 22, 2009, making this Application timely.

In summary, Patentee requests the correction of the PTA from the 488 days indicated on the face of the '684 Patent to 1,105 days. This represents the sum of the Office's delay calculated from §§ 1.702(a-e) (the sum of 625 days + 660 days), minus the sum of Patentee's delay calculated from §§ 1.704 (the sum of 87 days + 59 days + 34 days).

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.705(d) and the instructions provided by the USPTO in the November 10, 2009, Decision, this Application for Patent Term Adjustment is being filed no later than two months after the December 22, 2009 issuance of the '684 Patent, and is therefore timely filed. The Director is authorized to charge Patentee's Deposit Account 19-4880 for the required fee as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.18(e) (\$200.00).

As required by §§ 1.705(d) and 1.705(b)(2), a Statement of the Facts is set forth below. For the purposes of clarity, references to "this Application" refer to the present Application for Patent Term Adjustment, whereas references to "the '197 Application" refers to U.S. Application No. 10/525,197, which is the application that matured into the present '684 Patent.

I. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

A. The correct patent term adjustment and the basis or bases under §1.702 for the adjustment

Pursuant to §§ 1.702(a) and (b) and §§ 1.704(b) and (c)(10), Patentee submits that the total correct patent term adjustment for the '684 Patent should be 1,105 days. As discussed in

Attorney Docket No.: Q86306 U.S. Application No.: 10/525,197

further detail below, this number is derived from the sum of the Office's delay calculated from $\S 1.702(a-e)$ (the sum of 625 days under $\S 1.703(a) + 660$ days under $\S 1.703(b)$), minus the sum of Patentee's delay calculated from $\S 1.704$ (the sum of 87 days + 59 days + 34 days).

For the Commissioner's convenience, Patentee presents the following table illustrating the relevant dates and delays attributable to the USPTO and to Patentee under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.703 and 1.704, respectively. The transaction history of the present application as reported in PAIR, which shows all of the dates on which transactions took place in the present application (including those dates and transactions not discussed here because they do not involve delay), is attached as Appendix 1.

Attorney Docket No.: Q86306 U.S. Application No.: 10/525,197

Date	Event	USPTO Delay (and relevant section of the CFR)	Patentee Delay (and relevant section of the CFR)	
12-22-2009	Issue date of U.S. Patent No. 7,635,684	660 days (§ 1.703(b) and § 1.703(b)(4))		
11-10-2009	Application for Patent Term Adjustment dismissed as premature	1	0 days - (§ 1.704(e))	
7-16-2009	Patentee files Application for Patent Term Adjustment	↑	(§ 1.704(e))	
7-14-2009	Mail date of the entry of Patentee's 312 Amendment	↑	34 days (§ 1.704(c)(10))	
6-11-2009	Patentee files 312 Amendment	1		
4-17-2009	Mail date of Notice of Allowance	1		
3-9-2009	Patentee files amendment after final Office Action	↑	59 days	
10-9-2008	Mail date of final Office Action	1	(§ 1.704(b))	
7-3-2008	Patentee files response to non- final Office Action	1		
2-22-2008	Date triggering the beginning measurement of USPTO delay under 37 C.F.R. § 1.703(b)	↑	87 days (§ 1.704(b))	
1-7-2008	Mail date of non-final Office Action	1 8		
2-22-2005	Present application completes § 371 requirements			

Attorney Docket No.: Q86306 U.S. Application No.: 10/525,197

B. Delay attributable to the USPTO (the relevant dates as specified in §§1.703(a) through (e) for which an adjustment is sought)

Patentee respectfully submits that the total delay attributable to the USPTO under 37 C.F.R. § 1.703 is 1,285 days.

The delay attributable to the USPTO stems from (1) a delay of 625 days under 37 C.F.R. § 1.702(a)(1); and (2) a delay of 660 days under 37 C.F.R. § 1.703(b). Regarding the first, 625 day, delay, Patentee notes that the present application fulfilled the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 371 on February 22, 2005. However, the first Office Action did not issue in the present application until January 7, 2008. 37 C.F.R. § 1.702(a)(1) specifies in relevant part that USPTO delay will be calculated as "[t]he number of days...in the period beginning on the day after the date that is fourteen months after the date on which the application ... fulfilled the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 371 and ending on the date of mailing of [] an action under 35 U.S.C. 132." 625 days passed between the fourteen-month anniversary of the present application's fulfillment of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 371 (April 22, 2006) and the date that the January 7, 2008 Office Action was mailed (including the date of mailing of the Office Action). Accordingly, this period accounts for the first 625 days of USPTO delay.

The second USPTO delay of 660 days is attributable to 37 C.F.R. § 1.703(b), which specifies in relevant part that USPTO delay includes "the number of days...in the period beginning on the day after the date that is three years after the date on which the...national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) in an international application and ending on the date

Attorney Docket No.: Q86306 U.S. Application No.: 10/525,197

that the patent was issued." Accordingly, this period of USPTO delay began the day after February 22, 2008. Because the nine days between the filing of the Notice of Appeal on April 9, 2009, and the mailing of the Notice of Allowance on April 17, 2009, are not included in the calculation of the USPTO's delay (37 C.F.R. § 1.703(b)(4)), the USPTO delay under 37 C.F.R. § 1.703(b) is 660 days.

None of the USPTO delay under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.703(a)(1) and 1.703(b) overlap with each other, and thus the total amount of USPTO delay is the sum total of the delay under each of these sections, as per the Federal Circuit's recent ruling in *Wyeth v. Kappos*, U.S. App. LEXIS 300 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 7, 2010).

Accordingly, Patentee respectfully submits that the delay attributable to the USPTO under 37 C.F.R. § 1.703 for the '684 Patent is 1,285 days.

C. Delay attributable to Patentee (any circumstances during the prosecution of the application resulting in the patent that constitute a failure to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude processing or examination as set forth in § 1.704)

Patentee respectfully submits that the total delay attributable to the Patentee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.704 is 180 days. This delay stems from (1) an 87 day delay between the USPTO's mailing of the January 7, 2008 Office Action and Patentee's response; (2) a 59 day delay between the USPTO's mailing of the October 9, 2008 Office Action and Patentee's response; and (3) a 34 day delay between Patentee's June 11, 2009 filing of a § 312 Amendment and the USPTO's response to the 312 Amendment.

Regarding the first two delays ((1) and (2) above), 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(b) in relevant part states that an Patentee incurs delay equal to the "cumulative total of any periods of time in excess

Attorney Docket No.: Q86306 U.S. Application No.: 10/525,197

of three months that are taken to reply to any notice or action by the Office making any rejection." Patentee responded to the January 7, 2008 Office Action on July 3, 2008, and thus incurred an 87 day delay (calculated beginning day after the April 7, 2008 3-month date for responding to the Office Action). Patentee responded to the October 9, 2008 on March 9, 2009, thereby incurring a delay of 59 days (calculated beginning the day after the January 9, 2009 3-month date for responding to the Office Action). Hence, Patentee's total delays encompassed by 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(b) is 146 days.

Regarding the third delay ((3) above), 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(c)(10) in relevant part states that when an Patentee submits a § 312 Amendment, it incurs delay equal to "[t]he number of days...beginning on the date the amendment under § 1.312 or other paper was filed and ending on the mailing date of the...notice in response to the amendment under § 1.312." In the present '197 Application, Patentee submitted a § 312 amendment on June 11, 2009 and the USPTO mailed its response on July 14, 2009. Thus, Patentee incurred a delay of the 34 days between these two dates (inclusive) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(c)(10).

Patentees respectfully submit that the submission of the Notice of Appeal and Petition for Extension of Time on April 9, 2009 do not constitute delay under 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(c)(10) because those filings do not represent a failure to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution of the application. 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(a). In particular, the Notice of Appeal and Petition for Extension of time were required to maintain the pendency of the present application because the <u>USPTO</u> failed to act upon Patentee's March 9, 2009 after-final Amendment in a timely manner. Had the USPTO acted upon Patentee's amendment at any time during the month

Attorney Docket No.: Q86306 U.S. Application No.: 10/525,197

between the filing of the amendment and the filing of the Notice of Appeal, then the Notice of Allowance would have issued prior to the April 9, 2009 filing, and thus would have negated the need for Patentee to file a Notice of Appeal or Petition for Extension of Time. Accordingly, it was the USPTO's delay, rather than Patentee's delay that led to the need for the April 9, 2009 filing. As a result, Patentee respectfully submits that the April 9, 2009 filings do not constitute a failure to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution of the application, and thus do not constitute delay under 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(c)(10).

In view of the above, the total delay incurred by Patentee in the '197 Application is 180 days (146 days under 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(b) plus 34 days under 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(c)(10).

D. Whether the patent is subject to a terminal disclaimer and any expiration date specified in the terminal disclaimer

The '684 Patent is not subject to a Terminal Disclaimer.

E. The adjustment as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.703(f) to which the '684 Patent is entitled

The total amount of patent term adjustment is specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.703(f) as being the period of delay attributable to the USPTO under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.703(a-e) less the amount of delay attributable to Patentee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.704. Accordingly, the '684 Patent is entitled to 1,105 days of PTA. This number is derived from the sum of the delay attributable to the USPTO under §§ 1.702(a-e) (the sum of 625 days + 660 days), minus the sum of the delay attributable to Patentee under § 1.704 (the sum of 87 days + 59 days + 34 days).

Attorney Docket No.: Q86306 U.S. Application No.: 10/525,197

II. CONCLUSION

In summary, Patentee respectfully submits that it is proper that the USPTO grant

Patentee's Application for Patent Term Adjustment. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Travis B. Ribar /

Peter D. Olexy Registration No. 24,513 Travis B. Ribar Registration No. 61,446

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE 23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 12, 2010

APPENDIX 1



United States Patent and Trademark Office

ne | Site Index | Search | FAQ | Glossary | Guides | Contacts | eBusiness | eBiz Alerts | News | Hefp

Patent eBusiness - 0	Serurad Patent 6	Application Information Retrieval	į
Patent eBusiness - 0		VEA	ist_
Patent Application Information	XXII Do	PYRAZOLE DERIVATIVES, MEDICINAL COMPOSITION CONTAINING THE SAME, MEDICINAL USE THEREOF, AND	
AIR)	10/525,197	INTERMEDIATE FOR PRODUCTION THEREOF	į
Patent Ownership Fees	ALTERNATION IN		apla
Supplemental Resources & Support	Select A New Case Al	polications by Application Transaction Image File Patent Term Controlly Foreign Fees Published Address & Assignments Data Pronty Documents Attorney/Agent Ref	eranx
	Transaction Hi		
atent Information	Date	Transaction Description	
ent Guldance and General Info	12-22-2009	Recordation of Patent Grant Mailed	
Codes, Rules & Manuals Employee & Office Directories	12-03-2009	Email Notification	
Resources & Public Notices	12-02-2009	Issue Notification Mailed	
	12-22-2009	Patent Issue Date Used in PTA Calculation	
atent Searches	11-18-2009	Dispatch to FDC	
tent Official Gazette	11-17-2009	Email Notification	
Search Patents & Applications	11-10-2009	Mail-Petition Decision - Dismissed	
Search Biological Sequences Copies, Products & Services	11-09-2009	Petition Decision - Dismissed	
AANTAL LIVERING A APILIPEA	07-22-2009	Application Is Considered Ready for Issue	
ther	07-17-2009	Issue Fee Payment Verified	
pyrights	07-16-2009	Petition Entered	
idemarks licy & Law	07-17-2009	Issue Fee Payment Received	
ports	07-14-2009	Mail Response to 312 Amendment (PTO-271)	
	07-13-2009	Response to Amendment under Rule 312	
	06-11-2009	Amendment after Notice of Allowance (Rule 312)	
	04-17-2009	Mail Notice of Allowance	
	04-14-2009	Mail Examiner's Amendment	
	04-01-2009	Document Verification	
	04-14-2009	Notice of Allowance Data Verification Completed	
		Examiner's Amendment Communication	
	04-14-2009		
	04-09-2009	Notice of Appeal Filed Request for Extension of Time - Granted	
	04-09-2009	·	
	03-11-2009	Date Forwarded to Examiner	
	03-09-2009	Amendment after Final Rejection	
	03-09-2009	Request for Extension of Time - Granted	
	10-09-2008	Mail Final Rejection (PTOL - 326)	
	10-08-2008	Final Rejection	
	08-06-2008	Date Forwarded to Examiner	
	07-03-2008	Response after Non-Final Action	
	07-03-2008	Request for Extension of Time - Granted	
	01-07-2008	Mail Non-Final Rejection	
	01-04-2008	Non-Final Rejection	
	02-22-2005	Information Disclosure Statement considered	
	01-02-2008	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU	
	07-06-2006	Correspondence Address Change	
	02-01-2006	IFW TSS Processing by Tech Center Complete	
	02-22-2005	Request for Foreign Priority (Priority Papers May Be Included)	
	02-22-2005	Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed	
	02-22-2005	Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed	
	02-22-2005	Preliminary Amendment	
	02-01-2006	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU	
	08-27-2005	Cleared by OIPE CSR	
	02-22-2005	371 Completion Date	
	08-22-2005	Application Dispatched from OIPE	
	08-22-2005	Notice of DO/EO Acceptance Mailed	
	02-22-2005	Initial Exam Team nn	

If you need help:

- Call the Patent Electronic Business Center at (866) 217-9197 (toll free) or e-mail EBC@uspto.gov for specific questions about Patent Application Information
- Retrieval (PAIR).

 Send general questions about USPTO programs to the <u>USPTO Contact Center (UCC)</u>.

 If you experience technical difficulties or problems with this application, please report them via e-mail to <u>Electronic Business Support</u> or call 1 800-786-9199.

You can suggest USPTO webpages or material you would like featured on this section by E-mail to the <u>webmaster@uspto.gov</u>. While we cannot promise to accommodate all requests, your suggestions will be considered and may lead to other improvements on the website.

Home | Site Index | Search | eBusiness | Help | Privacy Policy